

ir...ation bulletin

1968

1

communist party of israel  
central committee·tel aviv

January 1968

P. O. B. 1843

IN THIS ISSUE :

S. MIKUNIS : REPORT ■ GOVERNMENT  
MUST DO EVERYTHING FOR REALIZATION OF  
U. N. RESOLUTION ■ MESSAGE OF OCTO-  
BER BROUGHT TO MASSES ■ MASSES LISTEN  
TO CPI LEADERS CALLING FOR PEACE AND  
AGAINST ANNEXATIONS ■

HX  
632  
A1  
W9  
No. 1106

MAIN



## TO OUR READERS !

Thank you for returning a prompt answer to the questions set forth in our questionnaire, for giving expression to your solidarity with us, your satisfaction with the contents and form of our bulletin, - on one hand, - thereby greatly encouraging us, - and for forwarding to us financial contributions - on the other hand - that will help cover the expenses of publishing the bulletin and mailing it to you.

Dear Readers, please, accept our heartfelt thanks, those of you, who have already answered our request and those - and of this we are sure - whose letters to us are yet under way.

We repeat, your support greatly encourages and assists us in our endeavours to throw light on the situation in our country and in all this region; endeavours the cherished goal of which it is to advance peace, progress, democracy and socialism in this part of the world.

With fraternal greetings,  
The editorial board of the "Information Bulletin"

Please send your correspondence  
and contributions to :

Ya'aqov Silber,  
P. O. B. 1843, Tel Aviv (Israel)

## CONTENTS

For peace and the rights of the workers - S. Mikunis	4
From the anti-imperialist viewpoint - M. Sneh	15

### EVENTS OF THE MONTH

S. Mikunis in Parliament : The government must do everything for the realization of the Security Council resolution	24
Erhard, go home !	27

### ACTIVITIES

Biography of V.I. Lenin - Preface by S. Mikunis	29
Message of October brought to masses	32
Masses listen to CPI leaders calling for peace and against annexations	33
CPI leaders in the factories	34

### PARTY LIFE

Resolution of the CPI National Convention	35
New members join CPI	36

### SOLIDARITY IN STRUGGLE

Australian communist journal on Middle East	38
---	----

## FOR PEACE AND THE RIGHTS OF THE WORKERS

From the report by S. Mikunis, General Secretary CPI, to the  
21st Plenum (15. 10. 1967)

### The International Situation

The General Secretary of the CPI. devoted the first part of his address to the international situation and said i. a. :

"The forces of peace and socialism in the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence against imperialism and neo-colonialism have met with increased efforts on the part of the latter to contain them and force them backwards. The most striking example of this can be seen in the intensification of American imperialist aggression in Vietnam, the escalation of the brutal bombing of North Vietnam and the repeated threats of actual invasion of the territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam by the American Army. The suffering and heroic people of Vietnam have proved not only their ability to resist American aggression but their ability to meet head-on the powerful military machine and manpower of the USA. In their just and valiant struggle for freedom and independence, the Vietnamese people enjoys the generous and all embracing support of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and the political and moral support of all the peace-loving and progressive forces in the world including those in Israel. Our Communist Party is working for the unity of all these forces and their activization in public operations to demonstrate our solidarity with the people of Vietnam. "

"The national interests of Israel, the interests of peace and freedom, make it incumbent upon us to renew our struggle for joint efforts of all anti-Nazi groups in Israel against the policies of the Kiesinger-Strauss government in West Germany, to prohibit neo-Nazi activities in Bonn and an increase in neo-Nazism and anti-semitism there, and to fight against the policies of the Eshkol government in allying itself with the rulers of Bonn. "

"We must also make sure that the opposition of the democratic forces in Israel to the militaristic-fascistic regime in Greece is given sharper expression. The demand to restore democracy in tortured Greece, to free the thousands of political prisoners, to secure the release of the famous national composer, Mikis Theodorakis, is vitally important to all people of integrity in our country and throughout the world who cannot reconcile themselves with the enslavement of any people by the forces of internal reaction, aided and abetted by international imperialist reaction. "

In summing up this aspect of his address, Mikunis said : "The historical experience of our own people proves that the securing of our own real national interests is bound inexorably with our readiness to take up the cause of other peoples in their struggle for progress and anti-imperialism. "

### For a Just Israel-Arab Peace

"Our Communist Party is today involved in a great struggle to ensure a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab countries, between the people of Israel and the Palestine Arab people. We stand now only at the gates of that struggle." In demanding a comprehensive rather than a one-sided view of the issue from all those forces involved, S. Mikunis said : "We reiterate once again the principles and methods for securing Israel-Arab peace; we repeat again and again our support for the progressive aspects of the struggle of the Arab national movement for national and social liberation from imperialism and its feudal-bourgeois supports while at the same time negating completely its murderous attitude towards Israel. We will continue our methodical struggle against the policy of Israel's rulers in their dependence upon Western imperialist powers and their refusal to recognize the Palestine problem. We emphasize and repeat all this because there are many among the Communist parties in the world who have hung a false charge upon us - in which they themselves do not believe - that we have "desecrated the flag", God forbid !

And why ,?

★ Because we dared in recent years - in accordance with the best principles of Leninism - to appear in open battle and impressively against the chauvinism of Arab ruling circles and other Arab circles who have called for the liquidation of Israel. And there are those who are still calling for a renewal of hostilities. Because we warned that this warlike chauvinism - in the manner of Mao Tse-Tung's followers - serves the interests of imperialism, endangers the peace and gives comfort to the extreme militarists in Israel.

★ Because our principled and objective stand not only against anti-Arab Israeli chauvinism but against anti-Israeli Arab chauvinism as well and our call for an agreed peace settlement revealed the "secret" of silent surrender on the part of the functionaries of Communist parties, both large and small, to the pressure of this terrifying chauvinism of various Arab circles so influential in their own countries.

★ "Because our Communist Party stood together with the entire people of Israel on June 5 in defence of our very existence and the existence of the State of Israel when a sharp sword was pointed at our throat by the



military encirclement of the Pan-Arabic front of Arab countries. Because the CPI refused to accept the "recipe" of "aggression" as regards the Six Day War and because millions more refused and still refuse until this very day to accept it in those very same countries which continue to preach this "recipe".

"Our Communist Party determined its attitude towards the military struggle according to the political goals of the sides engaged in which the Arab side never once disguised its intention to liquidate the State of Israel. It is terrifying at times to see how this point is denied, even in the face of speeches by the President of Egypt himself - especially that made on the 15th Anniversary of the Egyptian revolution - and his allies in Iraq, Jordan, Syria and other places. Campaigns for war on Israel, the liberation of Palestine have been going on for years in Arab countries and in international forums. It is shameful that just in order to cover up a mistaken approach the existence of this goal is denied. In the best of cases, and this only after the Arab defeat, the guilt for this view was attributed to Ahmed Shukeiry alone or to some nationalistic groups. But Shukeiry's adventuristic programme was accepted in principle by the Arab summit meetings in whose name he was authorized to act - then and even now."

S. Mikunis recalled that the CPI, in the entire period that preceded the war, had come out against threats of force and the use of force on both sides of the border and had called for a mobilization of forces in Israel and abroad to prevent the war. With the outbreak of hostilities we fought for a cease-fire to prevent its spreading into a global conflagration. We appealed to peaceful forces the world over not to take sides in this armed conflict but to enforce peace between the opposing sides. We were the first, when the sounds of battle died down, to struggle for the liquidation of the results of the war together with the liquidation of the causes of the war : cancellation of military conquests in the framework of a peace settlement and security arrangements between the two sides."

#### Against Territorial Conquests and Against Unconditional Retreat

In criticizing the policy of the government of Israel, S. Mikunis said : "This Government, and especially the extreme nationalist and militaristic factors within it, has been struck dizzy by its military victories to such an extent that it has repudiated the very essence and content of the Six Day War which it itself had defined on the day of the outbreak of hostilities. Whether or not they thought about it at the onset of the war and during it, after the war they became fired with the idea of territorial annexation and began prophecying in this spirit at home and abroad. To our

great sorrow they have found considerable public support for this view.

Apart from the extremists whose public symbol has become the trinity : Begin, Allon and Dayan, even the more restrained members of the government have become afflicted with the disease of annexation of some sort or another. These two trends within the government itself, competing one against the other, have made it impossible for the government to adopt a clear principle or even a more general line in its political struggle which will make it clear to the Arab peoples and the world at large that ISRAEL SEEKS PEACE AND NOT TERRITORIAL CONQUESTS. And this is the most important, the most serious step to take, the most logical and just conclusion to be drawn from the Six Day's War.

AN ARAB WAR OF REVENGE AT SOME DATE OR ANOTHER IS LIABLE TO BE THE ANSWER TO THE TERRITORIAL EXPANSION PROPOSED ALMOST DAILY IN LOUD VOICES BY CHAUVINIST ELEMENTS HERE. Imperialistic intervention at the expense of both Israel and the Arab countries will be the result. People here are playing with fire !

Twenty years of the existence of Israel have proved that it is not territory that we lack but peace with our Arab neighbours. Even within the boundaries of the armistice agreements there is unsettled territory in no small degree. We cannot forget for a moment that Eretz Yisrael, Palestine, was and remains a country populated by two peoples. It is at one and the same time the homeland of the Jewish people and the Arab people. Our security and our national future will not be secured through adventurous attempts to annex conquered lands and establish rule over those living there but only through a peaceful settlement based on mutual recognition of the just rights of both.

S. Mikunis summed up this part of his address by saying : "We must move from an era of crossed swords to an era of cross-dialogue. This is what must be done in so far as it depends on us, and not a little depends on Israel as well."

### For Democracy and Workers' Rights

"The struggle for peace is also a struggle for democracy, and a struggle to prevent the militaristic, extremist, bourgeois right wing from gaining ascendancy over public opinion. Peace will limit their possibilities for arousing the passions of nationalistic superiority and complete disregard for everything else, near and far. The fight for peace is also integrated with another struggle which is exceptionally important at this time : the defense of the rights of the worker in general and the civil, eco-

conomic and cultural interests of the Arabs in occupied areas in particular. This is a struggle for a change in official policy towards peace, democracy and social progress, for an end to the "national unity" in the government which is neither national nor unified but rather the enforcement of a right-wing, militaristic, bourgeois extremist line upon the Eshkol government. The "national unity" government has become the most reliable support for the exploiting and destructive interests of foreign and local monopoly capital.

The struggle for peace, for defense of workers' rights and democracy, for paving a path to a socialist society in our country - requires a common front of PCI and Mapam as a lever for unifying the left, socialist forces in all of the workers' parties, for unifying all the democratic forces in the country for the struggle to change the traditional policy in accordance with the needs of the present and the future of the working class and the masses of the people, said Com. Mikunis in summing up this part of his address.

#### The Article of Hasnein Haykhal

In the course of his address S. Mikunis discussed the effect of the Six Day War on conditions in the Arab countries and said that "The war which they forced on Israel according to their own testimony from the middle of May and onwards must of necessity provoke a soul-searching and new reckoning as regards their attitude to Arab-Israeli relations.

If we ignore for the moment the warlike and adventurous attitude of Syria and Algeria, we can discern the voices emanating from Egypt and other Arab countries. True, the Khartoum Conference declared "no recognition, no negotiations, no peace with Israel" but since then there has been less sword waving and decision to conduct a "political attack" against Israel." Notwithstanding, the speaker devoted some words to the article of Hasnein Haykhal, the editor of Al Aharam, the Cairo daily on 29. 9. 67, in which he wrote : "The problem of Palestine will find its 'solution' either by the uprooting of the Israeli 'foreign body' from the region or by its natural and ultimate disintegration."

"Our Communist Party", continued Mikunis, "is opposed to the Pan-Arabic anti-Israel line of uprooting and elimination. We are opposed to the policy of the Eshkol government which ignores the legal rights of the Palestine Arab people. We have never for a moment ignored the general, international background of the Arab-Israel conflict nor the role of imperialism in this tragedy. Yet our party is forced to emphasize, in sorrow,



that the "annihilation" line of the pan-Arabic front which has been called anti-imperialistic, together with the expansionist circles in Israel only serve the idea of war, the interests of imperialism and local reaction. The forces of peace and progress, the forces of anti-imperialism in the region and throughout the world would do better if they examined the Israel-Arab conflict with a more objective eye ; if they refrained from a one-sided view, devoid of class distinction in which all Arabs become anti-imperialist and all Israelis pro-imperialist. "

### Imperialist Efforts

"From what we can see today it appears that the imperialist powers, two of them openly (France and Britain) and the main one (USA) 'secretly' meanwhile, are stirring up the results of the Six Day War very energetically - and in their own interests. Openly and in secret imperialism has woven a noose around the issue of Israel-Arab peace. Openly and in secret it has attempted to preserve the state of hostility between Israel and the Arabs, while the smell of oil is never far from its nostrils.

We would like to take this opportunity to state clearly that the tactics we have employed over many years still remain in force, according to which - while at the same time fighting for the implementation of the party's peace plan - we do not arbitrarily reject other peace plans, even partial ones, on condition that they in some way serve the cause of peace and the just rights of the Arabs and of Israel. Our line was and remains - a discussion of every proposal, whether from within the party or without, on its own merits."

### Concerning the One-Sided Position of the Soviet Union

In another part of his lecture S. Mikunis turned to the question of Soviet policy as it pertains to the Israel-Arab conflict, saying : "To our great sorrow open criticism of the "annihilate Israel" slogan, which appeared in the Soviet press from the beginning of August, has again disappeared recently. True, the criticism was reserved for "certain Arab circles" of Ahmed Shukeiry. Heads of state and presidents were "excused" from this guilt though it is known that many of them belong to these same circles. Nonetheless the criticism was encouraging to those who hoped for a positive change, for a sobering up in the Arab countries as a result of even this emasculated criticism.

We haven't got the slightest doubt that the Soviet Union not only recognizes Israel's right to existence but that it desires peace in the region. But we are convinced that under present actual conditions, the Soviet Union's re-

turn to its supposedly smooth and learned formula calling on Israel to retreat unconditionally without calling for a just peace between the sides neither helps reduce tension in the area nor helps sober up the Arabs from their visions of annihilating Israel. Moreover, it is clear that this one-sided position on the part of the socialist countries strengthens the hand of Israel's militarists and chauvinists. This one-sidedness depreciates the very idea of peaceful coexistence which for so long had aroused the support and respect of all peoples.

The continuation of the anti-Israeli propaganda campaign founded on the parallel between Israel and Hitler's Germany has done untold damage to the prestige of socialism all over the world. Not only does it not convince anybody : it merely arouses distaste and disgust among all simple and honest people. Such propaganda is liable to incite anti-semitism in various countries and to put the Jews of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in an unpleasant position. This doesn't refer to Romania which has taken an independent and principled stand in the Middle East crisis.

Developments since May-June of this year have proven that the stand of our party was borne out by events. We came out against the Soviet Union's all out support for the Pan-Arab front in the Israeli-Arab dispute, and called on them to come out for peace between the two sides. We pointed out that it was not enough to recognize the basic existing contradiction between the people of the area and imperialism; one had to take into account the national antagonism between Israel and the Arabs which is exploited by imperialism, and which at that time proved to be the decisive antagonism. "

"It appears that the bonds positive in themselves, between the socialist countries and some communist parties and representatives of the Arab national movement on different levels of development exercise a mutual influence. Reality has shown that "something" negative has accrued to our communist parties from the regressive aspects of the Arab national movement, at least is so far as Israel-Arab relations are concerned.

In an article "Problems of the Near East" which appeared in the Soviet journal "International Affairs" (No. 9, 1967), the author V. Kodreatzev states that Israel's War of Independence in 1948 against the invasion of Arab armies and British guidance (this fact is not mentioned to be sure) was an aggressive war of conquest. It follows that this is what was so ardently defended by the most authorized Soviet representatives in the UN at this time ! The article further justifies the closing of the Straits

of Tiran and the Suez Canal to Israel shipping, and considers Arab beligerency against Israel for the past twenty years as "understandable". The basis of Arab unity is neither geographical, national or religious. It is anti-imperialism. There is no mention made whatsoever of any Arab transgression against Israel. Israel's defensive war is merely another link in the aggressive chain of overall American imperialist strategy.

In summing up the Six Days War the Soviet author writes : "This was no clash of narrow national interests between a few countries. Here was a frontal opposition between the forces of progress and the forces of reaction, the forces of peace and the forces of war, the forces of socialism and the forces of imperialism." Very simple. And as far from the truth as East from West.

As the Khartoum Conference the "importance of anti-imperialist Arab unity" was demonstrated by two very important resolutions which were adopted : renewal of operation of the oil pipelines to those powers which supported Israel's aggression; and refusal to conduct negotiations directly with Tel Aviv (an article from "New Times", No. 39, by Belayev and Primakov), while at the same time refusing to recognize Israel and reach peace with her. If this is the case, what remains of the principle of the peaceful solution to all outstanding problems between nations; what is the meaning of this forgiving attitude towards the imperialist powers when compared to the hostility towards its Israeli "tool", as they call it ?

In an article by Khaled Bagdache, the General Secretary of the Syrian Communist Party, which appeared in "Nidal - a Sha'ab" and the most important parts of which appeared in the Soviet weekly "Za Rubes-hom" No. 40, we searched in vain to find the concept of "peaceful co-existence" with Israel or even any willingness to seek an acceptable basis for peaceful coexistence. The demand "to liberate the conquered territories and remove the results of Israel aggression" are not accompanied by so much as a hint towards a solution. Instead he calls for the "strengthening of the defence potential and military power of the Arab countries" while "at the same time introducing serious military training for the masses of people." Khaled Bagdache advises the communists to refrain from speeches and slogans which produce a bad international echo, not because they are bad in themselves but because they are not capable of being implemented.

So the answer is, it appears, not a just solution to end the Israel-Arab conflict but serious preparations for another round. Not immediately, however, as the Chinese would have it."

The last part of S. Mikunis' address was devoted to relations between the C. P. I. and the CPSU and ~~and~~ other Communist Parties. "Certain communist parties, faced with dissatisfaction and unrest in the ranks because they toed the Soviet line regarding the Six Day War and its consequences, have launched a propaganda campaign designed to slander our party and its leaders. Some of them were even forced to call the victims of Hitlerism - Hitlerites. This can only mean that sympathy for Israel is very great !

True, the pro-imperialist policy of Israel's governments, against which we have fought systematically, adds fuel to anti-Israeli programmes and gives room for wide criticism. But we know governments which are more reactionary and regimes which are much much worse that never aroused such extreme name-calling and such slanderous attacks. The Jews in general and the Jewish State in particular are given special consideration - as usual !

Israel is to blame for everything; imperialism not really; Arab reaction - they don't even come into the picture in so far as the plight of the Palestine Arab people is concerned. This is "scientific objectivity" and rests on "conscience".

A great spate of "friendly advisers" have appeared in our camp in various countries and they are full of "good advice" for Israel. At the basis of all this advice is one percept : the pacification of Arab chauvinism. There are those who forward a most attractive proposal to return to the 1947 partition plan, noting in particular that the "new" country must have an equal number of Jews and Arabs. There are those who have resuscitated the concept of "the dangerous international conspiracy of Zionism", a very telling phrase which was popular in certain trials towards the end of the period of Stalin's personality cult. There are those who instead of conducting an ideological discussion with Zionism - and there is something to argue about - resort to criminology, comparing Zionism with the international Mafia. Jewish bourgeois nationalism as expressed in the ideology and practice of Zionism is incomparably more "monstrous" than any other nationalism which can be found in the world today. There is one particularly "scientific", "dialectic" suggestion which has been raised : the "dezionization of Israel". What about a slogan : "decatholicization of Italy" ?



The question of "dual loyalty" has also been raised regarding the Jews. Accordingly it is forbidden for Jews in this or that country to show concern over the fate of Israel and the people of Israel - the survivors of the Hitler gas chambers, of anti-semitism and progroms. Non-Jews may, Jews may not ! Jacques Couland raises a finger at those who called on the Jews of France to demonstrate solidarity with Israel by accusing them of trying to turn the Jews of France into propaganda agents for a foreign country (Cahiers du Communisme no. 7-8, page 41). We never knew that France was not allowed to show solidarity and even raise funds for other peoples. Why are the French in Quebec allowed feelings of sympathy and bonds with France, for example, while the Jews in France are denied the right of sympathy with Israel ? Does this stand in contradiction to the loyalty of the French-Jewish citizen to his French homeland ? Why is it necessary to "develop" the lofty, humane and moral ideas of communism ? The great uniformity which characterizes in this way all of these ideological and political outpourings indicates that they all derive from a common inspiration."

Our Reaction to the fight of communist parties against the C. P. of Israel

"The efforts to "build up N. C. L. (Rakach) within the communist movement also stem from some common source . Strange that N. C. L. 's defense of pan-Arab nationalism and its unbridled anti-Israeli propaganda are hailed as an expression of internationalism. God help us ! When "all the Arabs" constitute an "anti-imperialist front" and "all Israelis" an imperialist front, it is no wonder that superhuman efforts are being made to advance N. C. L. in the movement despite the fact that it has not and cannot have any position whatsoever among the Jewish working class in Israel. It is completely rejected because it is tainted with Arab chauvinism on the one hand, and Jewish national nihilism on the other.

The discussion between the Communist Party of Israel and the CPSU over the Israel-Arab question cannot be decided by sticking labels on us as was common practice "in the old days" or by making arbitrary and one-sided judgements. Smearing our party abroad, as was done by Gus Hall in America, is detrimental not to us but to those engaged in the smear campaign. It testifies that they themselves do not respect the principle of the independence and equality of communist parties nor the principle of non-interference of one party in the affairs of another. Smearing our party and imposing sanctions on it arouse suspicions that we are witnessing a return to the days of Stalin's cult. This does not frighten us nor will it frighten us in the future. It only reenforces our intention to wage an all out ideological and political campaign on all the disputed issues !



We have allies in the world communist movement and their numbers will grow as soon as this periodic "eclipse of the sun" passes. What has counted in the past and what will count in the future is not the "closing of doors" to us outside, but the opening of the hearts and minds of the working class of Israel to communist truth, to the policy of patriotic, internationalist truth as proffered by our communist party.

There are many difficult trials before the communist party, before Israel as a whole. We are certain that what brains are not able to do today, brains and time together will do tomorrow and the day after. There is reward for our efforts and the workers of Israel will not easily forget it. Our position is just and our position will win out ! A true communist policy has the best chance : one that knows how to put into operation the basic universal truths of Marxism-Leninism, applying them to the specific conditions of each country and people. This is the policy of our party.

We are heavily burdened on many fronts - our newspapers, especially "Kol Ha'am", in printing and circulation, our publications in Arabic. We are carrying many serious tasks in political and organisational work fighting for peace, for solidarity with Vietnam, for defense of the working people and democracy, for solidarity between Jewish and Arab workers in the struggle against their common class foe both at home and abroad.

Members of the Party, members of the YCL, sympathizers are called upon to assure a fitting tribute to the fiftieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution by showing greater unity and greater action in organising class conscious workers in factories and in the neighbourhoods in the struggle for peace, democracy and the rights of the working class."

FROM THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST VIEWPOINT

by Moshe Sneh ("Kol Ha'am" 24.11.1967)

In the discussion which we are obliged to conduct within the World Communist Movement on the Middle East crisis, we encounter not only the view that is opposed to our own and the view that accepts our approach, but also a mid-way view which runs as follows: from the viewpoint of the Israel-Arab dispute in itself - you are undoubtedly right, but from the over-all viewpoint of the global struggle against imperialism, the Soviet approach is the correct one. . . We reject this mid-way approach and re-affirm that our stand regarding the dispute in our region emanates from both national and international considerations and that it is correct also in terms of the general struggle against imperialism.

Those who advocate the official Soviet policy apparently sense its weakness on the decisive question of defining the nature of the dispute and consequently of determining their attitude towards it. They therefore repeat over and over again their own version with a definitive finality, without however basing it on proof or reasonable argument. For example, in the Soviet monthly "Asia and Africa Today" (Moscow, October 1967), the article "For the Just Cause of the Arab peoples" opens with the following unequivocal but unproved statement: -

"The entire course of events in the Near East since June 1967 has fully confirmed the correctness and the profundity of the analysis and evaluation of the situation in that region of the world made by the July Plenum of the Central Committee of the CPSU. The world public has seen in practice that what is happening here is not a clash between nations but a deliberately prepared plot by the most reactionary international imperialist forces, who exploited the Israeli machine against the Arab states which are marching along the path of social progress and active struggle against imperialism".

Is this really the case? Has "the world public" really "seen in practice" that the Israeli-Arab clash is not at all a clash between nations, like the conflict between India and Pakistan or that between Turkey and Greece etc., but is only an imperialist plot in which Israel is a blind tool, lacking a will of its own, in the hands of imperialism, that the Arab states have united in an anti-Israeli front for the sake of "social progress and the active struggle against imperialism", without an iota of chauvinistic hatred for Israel? Is this really the case, and has the world public indeed "seen this in practice?" It seems to me that anyone who reads the words of the Soviet editor with some careful attention can only gather from them that the writer himself is well aware that what

the world public sees in practice is the national element in the Israeli-Arab dispute, it does not overlook this element. But he prefers to attribute to the world public the very opposite of what it actually sees because he cannot disprove this with evidence and reasoned arguments. For our part, we stand firm in our view that, for the sake of the general anti-imperialist cause, all the socialist states and communist parties should have placed the Israeli-Arab dispute in its proper national context and refrained from supporting any side against the other, but instead should have influenced both sides in this direction of negotiation, mutual agreement and peace. We have expressed this view all along, and have tried to persuade the international Communist movement accordingly through the months and even the years before the outbreak of the armed conflict, and now in the light of the experience of the Six-Day War and the subsequent developments, it is our intention to prove retroactively the correctness of our stand from the viewpoint specifically of the anti-imperialist interest.



If the Soviet Union and other socialist countries had, in recent years, acted in accordance with the policy expressed in the statement of the Soviet Foreign Ministry of April 17, 1956 and which later was taken up again in the joint Soviet-British declaration (London, April 26, 1956) and in the joint Soviet-French Declaration (Moscow, May 19, 1956) and again after the Sinai-Suez War in the Soviet Declaration of February 13, 1957 and in the Soviet Note of September 6, 1957 to the British Government; and later in the Soviet Note to all the heads of state sent on December 31, 1963 and finally in the joint Soviet-Egyptian statement (Cairo, May 24, 1964); i. e. if the line were still followed of a peaceful settlement of the Israeli-Arab dispute mutually agreed upon between the Arab states and Israel with the help of international factors, including the USSR - the dispute would have lost much of its sharpness (even if it had not in the meantime been finally brought to a settlement) and imperialism would not have been able to exploit the intensification of the conflict for its own benefit, while the Soviet Union would have extended and intensified its influence among the peoples on both sides of the disputed borders as a power that is helping the peoples of this region to reach a peaceful settlement among themselves.

If the Arab declarations of "War of liberation of Palestine from the Israeli occupation", of "wiping out Israel", of "annihilating Israel" etc. had encountered severe condemnation on the part of the diplomacy, the press and the radio of the Socialist countries - the tension in Israeli-Arab relations would never have built up to such dangerous dimensions as it did in the spring of 1957. These declarations however were not condemned

or even criticised - neither when voiced by Shukeiry nor when pronounced by Abdul Nasser. Articles on the decision of the Communist parties of the Arab countries to support the "Palestine Liberation Organization" (founded by Shukeiry) were published both in the international Communist monthly ("Problems of Peace and Socialism") and in the highly-esteemed Soviet monthly "Problems of the History of the CPSU". And even though the Communist Party of Morocco did not, together with its fraternal parties, sign the above resolution in April 1966, its Secretary General, Ali Yata, hastened on June 5th of this year to issue a declaration in Casablanca to the effect that Arab strategy makes it essential now to determine as its aim "the annihilation of the State of Israel". And even now, after the Six-Day War, when Khaled Bagdache, Secretary of the Syrian Communist Party, condemns those declarations and slogans, he rejects them only on the grounds that they are unrealistic and were timed "before due preparations for an attack had been made. . ."

According to the current official Soviet version, the declarations of intent to destroy Israel only helped imperialism; consequently, this Soviet attitude in itself leads to the conclusion that the failure to prevent such declarations from being made and the failure to oppose them by even a single word of public criticism, were also of help to imperialism. That is exactly what we maintain. But of even greater importance than preventing declarations on annihilation is prevention of the intention to annihilate; uprooting it from the thinking, the emotions and the imagination of the Arab statesmen who, after all, do not want to be of help to imperialism. . . Or, to put it even more simply : to declare that every intention or slogan of wiping out the state of Israel is reactionary and pro-imperialist ! And if, to this day, we have not been privileged to hear any declaration of this kind - that in itself is of help to imperialism.

This is not merely a matter of declarations; for there were also acts of aggression on the part of the Arab states against Israel before June 5, 1967 : there were terrorist incursions - by layers of mines and explosives; there was shooting at farmers cultivating their fields, and setting fire to fields - and these acts, we know, were ignored. We, the Communist Party of Israel, were opposed to the system of armed retaliation on Israel's part, we condemned the military incursions across the border, but the Soviet press and Soviet diplomacy refused even to mention the acts of murder and of sabotage perpetrated by the Arabs, and thereby fanned the flames of Israeli militarism. Was this covering-over of Arab terrorism intended to foil the "imperialist plot to exploit the Israeli war-machine against the Arab countries" - in the words of the Soviet writer - or on the contrary, was the only result of this covering-over to create a pretext for the military conflagration between Israel and the Arabs that served



the imperialist plot - again, in accordance with the above Soviet formula ?! In our view, then as now, it would have been in keeping with the principles of Communist policy and the interests of peace, if the major Socialist power had raised its voice and exerted its influence against both Arab terrorism and Israeli retaliatory incursions; and in favour of adherence to the armistice agreements and of progress towards a peace settlement. But this was not the case, and this fact again was exploited by imperialism.

At the end of May 1967, the Communist Party of Israel approached all the fraternal parties to act for the withdrawal of the Egyptian and Israeli armies from both sides of the border, for an end to the threat and the use of force on both sides; for lifting the embargo on Israeli shipping in the Tiran Straits; and for the convening of an international conference to reach a peaceful solution to the problems of the Middle East. It will be recalled that all this was of no avail and the situation deteriorated steadily up to the outbreak of war. We have, however, become even more firmly convinced that our stand was the correct one in terms of the struggle against war and imperialism.



When the war broke out, we regarded it as a war of defence on the part of the people of Israel for their actual physical existence and for the sovereignty of the State of Israel; but the Big Powers we demanded that they take no side in the dispute but rather they should act for a cease-fire and for a peaceful settlement. The Soviet Government on June 9, 1967, convened a consultative meeting of eight European socialist states, at which they (excluding Romania) signed a declaration giving unilateral and absolute support to the Arab side to the dispute.

If our view had been accepted, the military defeat of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iraq would have remained the failure of the Arab states alone. Only the fact that the socialist states rallied to the support of the Arab states, unjustifiably and unnecessarily accorded the Arab defeat the significance of a defeat for the anti-imperialist camp as a whole.

After this, there came a second failure - and this, too, was both unjustified and unnecessary. Upon the demand of the Soviet Union, a special Assembly of the United Nations was convened. At a loss, this forum passed the issue on to the regular Assembly, and this in turn passed it to the Security Council. The reason for the failure of Soviet initiative at the Special Assembly lies in its one-sided approach to the dispute : the condemnation of Israel as the aggressor, the demand that Israel should



withdraw immediately and unconditionally, and the imposition on Israel of the payment of compensation for the benefit of the Arab states... It is not surprising that the United Nations Assembly did not even debate a resolution of this kind, and even the far milder resolution which was eventually supported by the Soviet delegation was defeated in the vote. If the Soviet Union had adopted an all-round and balanced stand, as the initiator of negotiations and agreement between the Arab countries and Israel, it would have appeared in the correct light that befits it - - as a socialist power that promotes peace in the world; and thereby it would have dealt a blow at imperialism.

And now the third failure has come about - at the Security Council, and once again it is both unjustified and unnecessary. And this failure, from the anti-imperialist viewpoint, is that the resolution which was accepted unanimously and without any actual opposition from the parties concerned, the resolution which outlines a plan for an end to the war and a peaceful solution - was a British resolution or, in reality, a British-American resolution; that is to say, a resolution put forward in the name of the imperialist powers and not one initiated by the Soviet Union, or at least with its active participation. The change that was evident in the Soviet resolution presented in the final phase of the Council's deliberations, in comparison with the original Soviet position, proved to be "too late and too little" and the Soviet delegation did not present it for the vote but instead voted for the British resolution. Those, throughout the world and in Israel, who seek peace and are opposed to imperialism would have preferred it if the international initiative which takes into consideration the claims of both sides and presents an opening for prospects of a positive settlement to the state of war - had been a Soviet, socialist initiative and not an Anglo-American, imperialist one.

★ ★ ★ ★

There are those who say : all this may be correct but, outweighing all the failure and setbacks which have been noted so far, from the anti-imperialist viewpoint there is one important achievement - and that is the increase of Soviet influence in the Arab world. Let us examine this contention.

First of all, the cement of anti-Israeli feeling has not succeeded in moulding pan-Arab unity - as we on more than one occasion foretold in advance. The Arab camp, even with regard to Israel, is divided and disunited as it has never been before : at one extreme there is the President of Tunisia, calling for negotiations with Israel; and at the other there are the governments of Algeria and Syria which call for an immediate resump-

tion of the war; and in between there are President Nasser and King Hussein, who seek a temporary political solution but without permanent peace. On top of this, inside each Arab country, there are conflicting Western, Soviet and Chinese influences. Particularly noteworthy is the fact that, after the Six-Day War, severe opposition to the Soviet line developed among the two "most progressive regimes" in the Arab world - i. e. on the part of the Algerian and Syrian leaders. The Algerian Foreign Minister, Bouteflika, declared after the Khartoum Conference that the principle of peaceful coexistence is to the detriment of Soviet policy in the Middle East; to the detriment of the Arab war against Israel; and to the detriment of all the peoples of the Tiers Monde. The President of Syria, Nur e-Din el-Atassi, declared on November 22, that "the only way out for the Arab people is armed struggle, it will lead to definite victory, whereas the way of 'peaceful' solution and compromise is the way of betrayal." And Ahmed Shukeiry said on November 21st that "the only path is a war of liberation of Palestine", and called for an intensification of the commando activities inside Israel and for the unification of all the Arab commando organizations that are fighting against Israel. (Lest it be said that the words of Shukeiry are not worth consideration, it is worth recalling that he is still head of the "Palestine Liberation Organization" and still participates, as No. 14, in the Summit Conferences of 13 heads of Arab states; it is he who, with Nasser's help, was behind the Khartoum resolution that there should be no recognition of Israel and no negotiations or peace; and his views - as we have shown above - are entirely in tune with those of the official President of Syria.) In what way then does Soviet influence in Algeria and Syria find expression? Is their agreement to accept economic and military assistance from the Soviet Union the decisive criterion for their policy? Or is their political line the decisive factor, although it is opposed to the "too moderate" anti-Israeli line of the Soviet Union, because the Soviet Union is not prepared to give up global peaceful coexistence with the United States and rally to a front against Israel in order to help the Arab countries? Is there not a danger here that Peking will reap the harvest sown by Moscow?

President Nasser and King Hussein have apparently come to accept the Soviet inspiration of seeking a political way out of the military defeat, seeking the help of the US and British governments to exert pressure upon Israel. What happened next: off went King Hussein to President Johnson (and promptly forgot his visit to Moscow, though he did not forget his visit to Madrid...); carried away by his "anti-imperialist enthusiasm" (according to the certificate of praise issued by the Central Committee of the Jordanian Communist Party in honour of its King) he went as far as to agree to the US counsels and the American resolution. This was a bit too much for Cairo, and not for Cairo alone, and then

came Egypt's urgent plea for a session of the Security Council where the Indian-Mali-Nigerian resolution was presented to counter the American one. Subsequent developments at the Security Council, up to the approval of the British resolution, are well known. But the fact should be noted here that the Egyptian and Jordanian delegations called upon the Soviet delegation not to abstain from the vote but instead, specifically to vote for the British resolution. We find then, that the distorted Soviet policy in the current Israeli-Arab dispute has driven Syria and Algeria towards China's arms, and Egypt and Jordan towards the Anglo-American line.

Is there not room here for wondering as to whether the added military power of the Soviet Union in the eastern basin of the Mediterranean and in several Arab countries is not harnessing it to a pact with pan-Arabism, by which it may not be able, or may not wish, to abide ?

★ ★ ★ ★

In the meantime, genuine anti-imperialist positions have been sacrificed on the altar of the anti-Israeli war.

Egypt is resuming her diplomatic ties with Britain; there is vigorous activity in both Cairo and Washington between the envoys of the UAR and the USA; Bonn is stepping up its economic penetration to almost all the Arab states; France receives oil concessions in Iraq; the war between Egypt and Saudi Arabia on the Yemenite front has been stopped and Sallal has been abandoned by Egypt and overthrown; the withdrawal of the Egyptian army from Yemen and Sallal's overthrow have caused the defeat of "FLOSY" and helped strengthen the prospects of Britain's neo-colonialist plans in Aden and throughout the South Arabian peninsula.

All these are serious concessions on the real front of anti imperialism, made for the sake of achieving Arab unity on the anti-Israeli front in the name of an imaginary anti-imperialism. Apart from this, there has been a break between the republican Arab regimes (between Egypt and Syria and Algeria) while on the other hand there has also been a rapprochement between the republican regime of Egypt and the monarchies of Jordan, Saudi-Arabia and Kuwait. In our view, these are indications that the campaign against Israel is weakening the struggle against imperialism in the Arab world.

This is a very weighty issue in the discussion between us and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Let us, for example, consider developments in Sudan, in whose capital - Khartoum - the Summit Conference, called "to eliminate the results of Israeli aggression", was held under pre-dominantly Soviet influence (Tunisia on the one hand, Syria and Algeria on the other, were not among the cele-

brants at Khartoum). And yet, after the Conference, the Sudanese government launched cruel persecutions of Sudanese communists. "Pravda" sharply condemned the anti-Communism of the Khartoum government - but on what grounds ? On the grounds that at this time when unity of the Arab forces on the front against Israeli aggression was so essential, the Khartoum government was persecuting the Sudanese communists who had proved their loyalty to this front !!! It seems to me that this seeming gain for Communist solidarity is belied by this un-communist justification. Sometimes, upon reading certain articles and speeches, one is left dumb-founded with the question : is the policy of the struggle against Israel really so "revolutionary" that the policy of the fight against imperialism itself, and the policy of the fight against truly pro-imperialist (Saudi-Arabia) and the anti-Communist tyrannical (Sudan, Iraq) reactionary forces should be subordinated to it ? For even the embargo on the Western powers, in the form of the cutting off of Arab oil supplies, was lifted at the Khartoum Conference - and all for the sake of the war against Israel.

There are also those who say : the Soviet Union has succeeded in rallying to its present policy six socialist countries in Europe and the majority of Communist parties in the world - and this is no small achievement at this time, when the number of socialist states and communist parties that have, totally or partially, rejected the adherence to the Soviet-centred uniformity that was practised in former years, has increased so greatly. It is only by presenting the Six-Day War as part of the global imperialist aggression that is a threat to world peace, to the security of all the socialist countries and to the independence of all the peoples - only in this way did the Soviet leadership succeed in rallying so great a consolidation to it . . .

We take the liberty to repudiate the above premise. Maybe the fact that Yugoslavia joined in signing the Moscow Declaration of June 9, 1967 gave rise to this erroneous impression; but after all, even after this, Yugoslavia is still not prepared to agree to a world consultation of Communist Parties, as the Soviet Union wishes. Even on the Israel-Arab issue itself, the unity which was achieved is far from satisfying the wishes of the Soviet leadership. China and Albania accuse Soviet Russia of "plotting" with American imperialism and Israel against the Arab peoples, and of abandoning the Palestinian Arab people - charging the USSR with bargaining behind the scenes of the United Nations instead of going to war with Israel... Romania and Cuba have not severed their diplomatic ties with Israel in line with Moscow, and the Romanian line is very close indeed to the line what we, the Communist Party of Israel, have been advoca-



ting. There are some communist parties, such as the CP of the Netherlands, which are very firmly opposed to the USSR's Middle East policy, and call for "a peace initiative rather than arms shipments"; a party which turned down the invitation to attend the Jubilee Celebrations of the October Revolution because of the distortions in Soviet policy on the problem of Israel (and the Indonesian issue). Even in those Communist parties, both in the East and the West, that have accepted the Soviet line, there is strong internal opposition to it. Some of this opposition is expressed openly while some of it seethes beneath the surface. And finally, the non-Communist forces of the Left, which cooperate with the Communist parties in various domains, are rebelling against the anti-Israel line, and this dispute over the Middle East interferes with the formation of closer partnerships on other agreed issues.

It therefore seems to us that Soviet policy on the Israel-Arab problem, rather than having succeeded in acquiring and uniting allies to rally around it has, on the contrary, here lost allies out of the very wide front which it had succeeded in building up concerning the Soviet position on other issues such as, for example, Vietnam (against the aggressive armed intervention of US imperialism); Greece (against the fascist military dictatorship); Germany (against the neo-Nazi revanchism).

Today, following the resolution of the Security Council to send a UN envoy to bring about a settlement between Israel and the Arab countries, the opportunity is presented of straightening out the line of Soviet policy by replacing support for the Arab side against the Israel side - by an all-round approach in the form of bringing both sides towards the negotiation table, towards mutual agreement and a stable and just peace. Such an approach on the part of the Soviet Union would cease to identify Israel absolutely with imperialism (despite the affinity of its ruling circles to the Western powers) and to identify the Arab countries absolutely with anti-imperialism (despite the affinity of some of their rulers to the Soviet Union); but would seek once again to recognise the legitimate rights and claims of both sides and the need to bring them to a fair adjustment. A Soviet approach of this nature would strengthen the influence of the Soviet Union in our region and heighten Soviet prestige throughout the world. To bring the hostility between the Arabs and Israel to an end, replacing it with peaceful and good-neighbourly relations in our region - this is the achievement that could deal a fatal blow at the intrigues of imperialism; this is what would enable the peoples of the region to throw off their dependence on foreign powers and to advance along the path of national and social liberation. And then the whole world - including the Soviet Union - would be witness to the fact that the people of Israel does not take the last place among the peoples advancing along this path...



## S. Mikunis in the political debate of the Knesset :

### THE GOVERNMENT MUST DO EVERYTHING FOR THE EFFICIENT REALIZATION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

"Our Communist Party stands in consistent opposition to the fundamental line of foreign and home policy of the government of 'national unity', but this is no reason not to estimate positively several important aspects of the political struggle that was led at the U. N. Assembly and at the Security Council by the Foreign Minister, Mr. Abba Eban. I am referring to the aspects of the struggle to prove the justification of the Six Day War as a war of national defence for the very existence and independence of Israel, to repel the attack of historical and present-day distortion with regard to the questions of the establishment and the situation of the State of Israel, to frustrate the fatal conclusions and proposals that were raised, following these distortions, by the Arab representatives and their supporters" - declared the C. P. I. General Secretary, Knesset member Shmu'el Mikunis in his speech during the political debate in the Israeli parliament on 11. 12. 67.

In continuation of his motivation, Com S. Mikunis said, i. a. :

"We never disregarded the international background of the Middle Eastern crisis in May-June 1967, but there were people who tried to disregard the national background of that crisis by putting forth the erroneous theory claiming that the Arab side is the just, the anti-imperialistic side, while the Israeli side is the unjust, the imperialistic side. It is true that imperialism has always exploited the Israel-Arab national strife for its own benefit, but this fact only confirms the assumption of my Communist Party that for the benefit of the anti-imperialistic struggle the socialist states should not have taken a stand supporting one side against the other one, but should have made efforts to bring together both sides so as to ease tension and attain mutual agreement and peace, as they did in cases of national conflicts in other regions of the world, and as Socialist Romania did in this case. The conduct of the political campaign at the United Nations Organisation in accordance with this distorted line that was close to blindness, brought its advocates no small failure."

After evaluating the unanimous resolution of the Security Council as a "reasonable and logical basis of a just struggle for a stable peace", Com. Mikunis dwelt upon the Soviet vote in favour of this proposal and said :

"The Soviet Union's joining of the British (in fact British-American) proposal, that was adopted by the Security Council despite the explicit and frank opposition of Syria and Algeria, renders this resolution more weight and more importance. This is, in a way, a certain amendment, whether voluntarily or necessarily, of the line of Soviet policy with regard to the Israel-Arab conflict, and even a prospect that the support of the Arab side against the Israeli side will be substituted by an all-sided approach. Whatever it be, this is the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the resolution of the Security Council ! But first of all and above all, the fate of the resolution is now in the hands of both the governments of Israel and the Arab states".

Furthermore, the speaker criticised the Israel Foreign Minister when he said : "The interest of peace, which is the supreme interest of Israel's people demands that the government view favorably all the aspects of the Security Council resolution. Enumerating the principles of the reso-

lution, the Foreign Minister did not mention, for instance, a principle of such fundamental importance as the solution of the problem of Arab refugees, the problem of the Palestine Arab people. A serious and honest approach to all parts of the resolution is the duty of the government of Israel as well as of the Arab governments. "

"Naturally, the 'welcome' and the angry interpretation given to the Security Council resolution by the President of Egypt in his last speech are rousing deep concern, while the rulers of Syria are absolutely rejecting the resolution and calling for a continuation of the war. The lines of thought and the plan of the V. A. R. government, in accordance with this speech, are : "no peace with Israel, no negotiations, no shipping through the Suez Canal, and on the other hand - the demand of an Israeli withdrawal from all the territories held by Israel before any other step is taken, without naming such a step. Every interpretation of the resolution that demands a 'prior' retreat and every other unknown step to be taken "later" - whatever its source - is an arbitrary interpretation, that is trying, knowingly or unknowingly, to destroy the basis of inter-connection and mutuality that appears in the Security Council resolution. Without this inter-connection there is no chance to advance towards peace and towards security, towards liquidating the danger of war in our region. "

The C. P. I. spokesman dwelt also on the attitude of the N. C. L. in the Knesset debate, and said :

"In this debate, it is no wonder, of course, that the N. C. L. representative, Knesset member Tewfiq Toubi, made in his speech an "about turn", he presented a verbal Hebrew translation of the about-turn that occurred in the attitude of the Soviet representative when he joined the resolution of the Security Council, with the consent of Egypt and Jordan. The arbitrary interpretation given by the Arab side and its Soviet supporters, demanding that first of all Israel must fully retreat from all territories held by her, appeared in the speech of the N. C. L. representative, too, in exact Hebrew translation. This time he also "dared" to criticise the rulers of Syria after "Pravda" voiced this criticism against the Arab "hotheads". At the same time, De Gaulle's speech found the approval of MP Tewfiq Toubi as a confirmation of his own words on the policy of Israel, but he did not point, even with a word, to the moral nature of this speech. I have no doubt, that this disgusting anti-Jewish and anti-Israeli speech of the General suits the taste of the Arab rulers, too, even when it smells of oil, and neo-colonialist interests are protruding behind it, but this can not justify the behaviour of a self-styled Communist not reacting against the words of the General when he is mentioning the subject.

Knesset Member Mikunis summed up his speech as follows :

"For the sake of peace, security, independence and the future of Israel we shall continue demanding that the government on its part do everything to maintain carefully the armistice agreements, to prevent the renewal of the armed conflict, to implement efficiently the resolution of the Security Council; to defend the interests of the Arab people in the Israel-held territories; to avoid that Israel be harnessed to any foreign band-wagon in the global and regional struggle; to reject any approach of despair as to the prospects of renewing the links with the Soviet Union.

The relations between peoples and not the relations of power will finally decide the fate of the Israel-Arab conflict. Only an independent Israeli policy is apt to bring Israel true friendship among the nations of the world - in the West and the East alike ! "

Draft Resolution of the C. P. I. Faction Summing up the Political Debate  
in the Knesset.

---

On the 11. 12. 67, at the end of the political debate in the Israel Parliament, the following resolution was tabled by Knesset member S. Mikunis :

1. The Knesset states, that the unanimous resolution of the Security Council on the present Israel-Arab crisis constitutes a reasonable and logical basis for the continuation of the struggle for a stable peace between Israel and the Arab countries, because it takes into account the just rights of both sides and combines them.
2. The Knesset demands that the government considers seriously all the aspects of the Security Council resolution and maintains full cooperation with the U. N. Emissary, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, so as to promote thereby - on its own part - the cause of talks and negotiations between the Israel government and the rulers of the Arab countries for the benefit of peace.
3. The Knesset demands that the government shall neither allow nor encourage accomplished facts of any kind in the Israel-held territories, because they might build up obstacles on the way to peace, on the way to the much-wanted improvement of Israel-Arab relations.
4. The Knesset demands that the government issues an authentic proclamation on the question of the just solution of the Israel-Arab conflict, and demands to put an end to the individual declarations, that are contradictory and sometimes even irresponsible, of these or other Ministers at any occasion whatsoever.

#### ERHARD, GO HOME !

Ludwig Erhard, the former Bonn Chancellor and recent guest of the Israeli prime minister, was not exceedingly satisfied with his visit here. The government and police, of course, received him with great pomp, but public opinion was rather unfavourable.

This, the chancellor felt during his visit to the Bar Ilan University where he was to be a guest-lecturer on the 6.11.1967. Demonstrations of students took place on his arrival at the University as well as during his lecture, and culminated when he left the lecture hall.

After the banquet which was arranged on his behalf, he was again met by students who accompanied his departure with boo's and slogans. Mounted police, who were called out for this "festive" occasion, remained near-by but refrained from action.

Erhard and wife, accompanied by the Ambassador of Bonn in Israel Rolf Pauls, the staff of the embassy and representatives of the foreign



ministry, arrived at the Simon University Hall, while students shouted "Down with the Nazis ! " and carried brandishing slogans as : "Then - 'Final solution', now - state visit", "Remember and don't forget ! " "6.000.000" and many others.

The Students Association asked the students to refrain from attending the lecture, and it was only the lecturers and the Board of Trustees of the University who were present in the hall.

"Kol Ha'am", the daily of CPI, published two leading articles condemning Erhard, his visit and the policy of fraternization with West German rulers. The article of the 6.11.1967 stressed the visit of the former chancellor and the news about the nomination of the Nazi Guenther Diehl as official spokesman of the present government in Bonn. The article states, i. a. :

"The news from Bonn about the nomination of Guenther Diehl as the new spokesman of its government proves that the leopard cannot change his spots. Guenther Diehl was a member of the Nazi party since 1938, worked at the Ribbentrop Foreign Ministry during the war, held the office of cultural attaché with the Vichy Government and because of his activities of a very specific character, he won the name of "the Goebbels of the Vichy Government." Ties of old friendship join the new spokesman of the government and its prime minister, chancellor Kiesinger - this not being the first time that both of them serve in the same government. The first time they worked together in the Hitlerite foreign ministry, both of them being members of one and the same Nazi party.

There were those who hoped that the growth of the neo-nazi, militaristic and chauvinist forces in West Germany would be checked by the Social-Democrats: joining the government. The strengthening of the neo-nazis in the latest regional elections in West Germany proves such hopes illusory. The nomination of Guenther Diehl serves as additional proof of the inability of the Social-Democrats to prevent veterans of the Nazi movement from penetrating into the government administration.

German militarism endangers world peace, and our peace in the first place. There is nothing which could make us forget this danger or make us retreat from struggling constantly for its final uprooting ! No argument whatsoever can justify the striving for closely-knit relations with the militaristic rulers in Bonn, since the security of our people cannot be bought, nor can its future be secured by an alliance with its arch-enemy."



BIOGRAPHY OF V. I. LENIN - IN HEBREW

On the occasion of the Jubilee of the Great Socialist October Revolution, a Hebrew translation of the "Short Biographical Sketch" of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, published in Moscow in 1966, was edited in Israel. Cde. Shmu'el Mikunis, Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Israel, has written the following short preface : -

Preface by S. Mikunis

This book, recording the story of the life and tremendous revolutionary activity of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, is presented to the Israeli reader on the occasion of the Jubilee of the Great Socialist October Revolution, which surged to victory under his leadership. The story of Lenin's life is that of his struggle for the inculcation of the ideas of scientific socialism, for the imparting of the theory of Marx and Engels to the working class in Czarist Russia and for the adaptation of the theories of the fathers of Marxism to the new era of developing capitalism in the early years of the twentieth century - the era of monopoly capital and imperialism. This is the story of the build-up and crystalization of the revolutionary Bolshevik party, which assumed the burden of leadership of the struggle of the working class and the masses of the people, of all the exploited and the oppressed against Czarism, capitalism and the landlords; and for the victory of socialism. This revolutionary struggle of Lenin's - a struggle conducted over many years of creative thinking and vigorous action - had the most tangible effects on the international labour movement.

This book tells - in so far as it is possible to tell - of the genius of the socialist revolution, of the founder of the first socialist state in the world that launched a new era in the history of all mankind - the era of the disintegration of capitalism and the establishment of socialism; it is the story of the architect of revolutionary strategies and tactics in the struggle for peace and friendship between peoples; for national and social liberation; for the liberation of mankind from the threats of war, of exploitation of man by man, of the oppression of one people by

another, of poverty and ignorance. Lenin in his struggle, of worldwide significance, against distortions of Marxism and against reformism and revisionism in the labour movement, stressed the importance of the guiding force of the working class and the necessity of unity in the struggle for democracy and socialism.

Lenin's peace manifesto symbolised the beginning of a new era in international relations. The socialist revolution, as Lenin foresaw, was not only the struggle of the revolutionary proletariat in various countries against their own bourgeoisie, but was to become the uprising of all the colonies and dependent countries against imperialism.

The October Revolution signifies the victory of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin. These ideas have continued to live and evolve in response to all the powerful revolutionary changes that have taken place in the world from 1917 to this day : in the formation of the world socialist system, in the disintegration of the colonial system under the blows of the national liberation movement of the peoples, in the expansion, the building-up of strength and the growing impact in the class struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries. Leninism lives on, bursts forth and advances in the historical struggle of our era - for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

Marxism, as viewed by Lenin, is not a dogma but rather a developing theory of life which must not only be adapted to the concrete conditions but also be in itself developed and advanced in every sense of the term. At this time, it is particularly relevant to stress that Lenin linked the practical activity of the Communist party with the struggle for the ideological purity of its theoretical fundamentals, with loyalty to the theories of Marx and Engels. Lenin stressed the close link between philosophy and politics, for Marxism - as he maintained - is the indivisible unity of scientific theory and revolutionary action. "The wisdom, the honour and the compass of our times" - such is the role that he attributed to the Communist Party, to the advance brigade of the working class, destined to guide its struggle against capitalism and for socialism.

Lenin - the teacher and mentor of the workers of the whole world, was the most warmly human of all individuals. A man of profound scientific thought, equipped with a wealth of knowledge and of human culture, a master craftsman in dialectical materialism - his entire being was a personification of modesty and unpretentiousness, of faith and confidence in the ordinary people. He devoted himself unstintingly to help

all the oppressed and the humiliated; his was a path of love for the people and internationalist loyalty. Deeply ingrained in him was a feeling for justice and sensitiveness towards small and weak peoples, towards their sufferings, their hopes and their struggle. Lenin was the bitter foe of class exploitation, of national oppression; of chauvinism, of national self-aggrandizement on the one hand and nationalist isolationism on the other. He foresaw a future of peace and brotherhood between the peoples and drew up the ideological and political outlines for equality of rights for the peoples, for cooperation and solidarity between the peoples without privilege or discrimination.

Lenin's theory was and still is the beacon, the pillar of fire that advanced in front of the camp of workers of the whole world, that illuminates their path in their struggle for their complete liberation. Lenin lives on in the minds and the hearts of the Soviet peoples, of the peoples of the other socialist countries, of all the exploited and the oppressed in all continents. He lives on in the tremendous achievements of the homeland of the Great October Revolution and of the other countries of the socialist system that cover one-third of the world, and in outer space; throughout all the developments of that period that we briefly call - 1917 - 1967.

At this time and in this era, when elements from various sides have arisen to challenge socialism in its fulfilment and there are manifestations of distortion of Leninism and his heritage, it is of vital importance to return once more to the story of Lenin's life and deeds, to its sources and its creator - to those springs that never dry, from which all those thirsting for freedom and human happiness have drawn, and still continue to draw.

This book, despite its natural limitations, is offered to the Israeli reader to widen his opportunity for acquainting himself with Lenin and his theories, his path to freedom and to the golden future of mankind - with unvanquished Leninism.

Shmuel Mikunis.

## MESSAGE OF OCTOBER BROUGHT TO MASSES

Party leaders and functionaries participated in public forums and debates devoted to the 50th Anniversary of the October Revolution, together with Israeli opponents of the ideas of October. In these appearances, the CPI leaders rebuffed the opponents of socialism, expounded the lofty ideals of the Great Socialist October Revolution and their deep importance and significance to the destiny of the world working class and the Israeli working class, to the fate of all peoples and the people of Israel among them. The message of October was also broadcast on the radio by Cde. M. Sneh, member of Political Bureau of the CPI.

Cde. S. Mikunis lectured on the October Revolution, in addition to meetings called by the CPI, in public meetings at the following places : Tel Aviv, Bat Yam and Ramat Gan.

"Le Monde", Paris, and "La Stampa", Rome, published interviews with the Secretary General of CPI (1. 11. 1967).

Cde. Sneh lectured on the October Revolution at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem; at a symposium at Bet Lessin (a Mapai institution) against Y. Gothelf, the Editor-in-Chief of "Davar" and Prof. Ch. Halperin, General Director of the State Bank of Agriculture; At the Tzavtah Club (Mapam) against the Mapam leader Talmi and Gilboa (liberal) ; at a meeting of the Emek Hefer kibbutzim against Prof. N. Oren of the Hebrew University and Colonel E. Rainer (Mapam); at a special meeting of religious youth (National Religious Party) at Haifa and at other places.

This time, the CPI was the only party which convened public meetings in honour of the October Revolution. Rakach (the New Communists of the Toubi-Vilner group) which previously announced to hold a meeting at Mugrabi Hall, Tel Aviv, -owing to lack of Jewish members and sympathizers and their complete isolation among the Jewish population decided to cancel it at the last minute.



## TERRITORY IS SUBORDINATE TO PEACE

### FIGHTING PUBLIC CAMPAIGN BY CPI FOR PEACE AND AGAINST ANNEXATIONS

Of course, not only the CPI, but also wide circles in Israel hope for a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Arab conflict, for a peace agreement which includes in its framework the evacuation of the territories held by the Israeli Defence Forces. However, the CPI was first in proposing a plan for peace and proposed concrete measures for the achievement of a peace settlement, which includes in its framework the evacuation of the occupied territories. It was in the very first days after the Six-Day War, on the 21st June 1967, that the CPI program was presented in the Israeli parliament.

But not only this. The CPI alone carries on a virtually daily consistent public campaign of the widest scope in a direct clash against the annexatory trends and the extremist circles in Israel. In addition to articles and information in the party press, primarily in the daily "Kol Ha'am"; in addition to public meetings called by the CPI in the cities and towns of Israel, the party's leaders participate in very many symposiums, debates and forums with political opponents of the party's anti-annexation line, the line of readiness to work for a just and lasting peace settlement based on mutual respect for the national rights of the people of Israel and the Palestinian Arab people.

Tens of thousands of Israelis have heard, in these forums, the message of peace from the CPI. There is no question that in this confrontation between two distinct lines, great sections of the public acknowledge the correctness of our position that territory is subordinate to peace and that the interests of peace are opposed to permanent conquests and annexation.

#### Mikunis : confrontation with members of government

Here is a partial list of the party's efforts in this vital activity in recent weeks :

The Secretary General of the CPI, Cde S. Mikunis, appeared at the following forums :

"Hilton Hall, Tel Aviv; Petah Tiqa, organized by Histadrut local council, against representatives of RAFI, Ahdut Avoda and Mapai; "Bustan" youth club of Mapai, Tel Aviv; Natania - Histadruth Hatll; Kfar Saba against representatives of Mapai and Rafi; Be'er Sheva, against Minister M. Kol,

Cde. M. Sneh , member of the Political Bureau, appeared at forums at the following places and institutions : The University of Tel Aviv , against M. P. Shofman (Herut) and M. P. Shulamit Aloni (Mapai); the Yachdav Club (Mapai) in Tel Aviv; at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, against Prof. N . Oren and A. Amir (from the Movement for a Greater Israel); at the Haifa Technion, against Prof. Gil'adi and the writer Moshe Shamir; in Tel Aviv at the Histadruth Hall "Bet Brenner", against M. P. Y. Kesseh (Mapai); at Ramat Gan at the Histadruth Forum against M. P. B. Azaniah (Mapai) and M. Erem (Achdut Avodah); at the Mapai Ideological Institute "Bet Berl", against I. Harel.

In addition, Cde. Sneh has lectured recently on the CPI Peace Plan in various kibbutzim and moshavim, among them : Moshav Tel Adashim, the religious Kibbutz Beeroth-Yitzhak, Kibbutz Mishmar David, etc.

#### Sneh contra Dayan

The symposium that took place in Tel Aviv in the Hechal Tarbut, 4,000 people attending, may be considered the high point in this campaign. The Minister of Defence, Moshe Dayan and Gen. Haim Hertzog (Rafi) participated and Cde. Sneh appeared against them. This event evoked unprecedented wide public interest and tens of thousands of Israeli tried their luck at the ticket offices to get into the auditorium which has "only" 3,500 seats.

This event which received tremendous coverage in the press and radio will undoubtedly draw thousands closer to the ideals of Israeli-Arab peace expounded by the CPI spokesman, Cde. Sneh.

#### C. P. I. LEADERS IN THE FACTORIES

The resolutions of the Security Council on the Middle East, the problems of devaluation and its affect on the working class - were the topics raised in many lectures held by the Communist Party of Israel in various factories.

In these workers' meetings that are usually organised in the factories during lunch time, members of the C. P. I. Politbureau and Central Committee - Comrades S. Mikunis, E. Vilenska, B. Balti, P. Tubin, E. Feiler and A. Haas - addressed masses of toilers in Israel's industrial centres, and were heartily welcomed by them.

The matter of collective contracts of employment to be signed for the year 1968 was discussed in many meetings of representatives of the C. P. I. Trade Union Department with shop stewards. Ways of action and struggle were summed up in these conversations.

RESOLUTION OF THE CPI NATIONAL CONVENTION :  
STRENGTHEN ORGANISATIONAL ACTIVITIES !

---

The National Convention of the C.P.I. regional and branch committees and editorial boards of the Communist press met in Jaffa on the 26.11.67. The convention discussed organisational questions of the Party and how to ensure the continued publication of "Kol Ha'am" as a daily newspaper.

The opening lecture was delivered by E. Vilenska, member of the CPI Politbureau; A. Lanzman, chairman of the Organisational Department of the Central Committee, wound up the discussion. The Secretary-General of the Party, S. Mikunis, gave the closing speech.

S. MIKUNIS ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

"If the Soviet Union had taken an all-round and objective stand at the consultation held in Moscow on 9.6.1967 on the Middle Eastern crisis, it is evident that it would not, after five months, have been compelled to arrive at the last minute to give its support to the Anglo-American proposal that was adopted by the Security Council on the 22nd of November" - said Comrade Mikunis, and he added :

"Had the Soviet Union adopted a stand as found expression in the line of our Communist Party, it would have enhanced prestige and gained wide possibilities for initiative in the campaign for achieving peace in the Middle East, instead of months'-long commitments that were the outcome of the one-sided and subjective approach to the Israel-Arab crisis and to both its national and international significance".

Analyzing the resolution passed by the Security Council, the Secretary-General of the CPI said that "this resolution, which had to take into account the attitude of the anti-imperialist forces, and basically takes into account the just demands of both the Israeli and Arab side, is liable to promote the cause of peace-making between them, provided both sides first of all display good will, and provided the discussion is not on what comes "first" and what "next", but rather that it is based on the correct and logical attitude formulated by our Party, which maintains that, within the framework of security arrangements and a peace treaty in which permanent borders are demarked, Israel will annul the territorial conquests. "

Referring to the erroneous attitudes of various Communist Parties towards the Israel-Arab conflict, S. Mikunis said :

"What common sense failed to do, time and objective necessity have accomplished. It will be interesting particularly for our Communist Party, to follow up and see what those of our comrades abroad, who accepted the one-sided Soviet stand toward the Middle Eastern crisis as the last word of Marxism-Leninism, will do now. How will they pass over to the other stand that was supported by the Soviet Union in the Security Council and which, to the best of our knowledge, is not the final stand in this matter because the final, just wise, principled and realistic stand will be that which has for a long time been put forward by our Communist Party.

This was and still is a patriotic and internationalist stand, conforming to the cause of anti-imperialistic struggle, national independence, peace and friendship between the peoples. From this viewpoint, the Party must improve its organisational activities, increase the circulation of the Party press and the means for its regular publication, widen its ranks and strengthen its influence among the working class and masses of the people, act untiringly for the unity of the workers and of all democratic and peace-loving forces, for the security and the peace of our country, for the defence of the workers' interests and rights, for democracy and Jewish-Arab toilers' solidarity."

The lively and practical debate at the National Convention, in which 31 comrades participated, took place in an atmosphere of unity and of a fighting spirit.

#### NEW MEMBERS JOIN C. P. I.

A festive atmosphere and a feeling of elation was sensed by all those who came to the "House of Culture and Friendship" at Bat-Yam on 27th October, and gathered around set tables to mark the joining of new members to the local C. P. I. branch. Amongst those present were members of the Political Bureau of C. P. I. and members of the Tel Aviv-Jaffa District Secretariat. S. Mikunis, Secretary General of the Party, congratulated the Branch on its achievements as well as the members who have just joined the ranks of C. P. I.

Moshe Landau, a member of the Secretariat, who opened and conducted the gathering, pointed out the connection between the admission of new members into C. P. I. and the Jubilee of the October Revolution, which is now being celebrated.



Ya'aqov Shalish, Secretary of the Branch, reviewed briefly the history of the Branch and its development, which was affected only slightly at the time of the Party split, and now, with the new members that have joined it, will increase its activity and influence amongst the public in Bat-Yam. He stressed that Party members are constantly working for political unity, by free and democratic debates and discussions, creating an Israeli Communist path to further the interests of the working people in our country and achieving longed-for peace.

#### Comrade Mikunis' message

The Secretary General of C. P. I. said in his message of congratulations, inter alia :

"The joining of new members to our Party is a great honour to those who join and a great responsibility to our Communist Party. It means joining a party which protects in the most consequential manner the true national interests of Israel, the vital interests of the working people, democracy and Jewish-Arab solidarity of toilers, which in a consistent manner and with great courage, struggles against the attack of capital and the regime on the rights of the working masses. No one can match us in our constant struggle for peace between Israel and the Arabs based on mutual recognition and mutual honouring of the just rights of both sides. Such peace is the vital interest to both peoples, and can effectively block imperialist intervention towards smashing the foundations of the robbing and enslaving interests of imperialism.

You have joined the Communist Party of Israel which is Israeli not only in name, but by virtue of its deep responsibility and its concern for the people and the homeland, for both Jews and Arabs, whose policy is both patriotic and internationalist, which draws its inspiration from Marxist-Leninist principles creatively adapted to the concrete conditions of Israel, in the complexities of the area. In the light of lack of judgement and the confusion prevailing in other parties over the question of a way out of Israel's complex and grave position, the clear path of our Party to peace, to Jewish-Arab cooperation, to full national and social liberation, stands out.

Our Communist Party deserves substantial support and an increase in its ranks, because in the serious trials with which it has been confronted it showed great ability of independent judgement, courage, resolution and devotion to the cause of Communism."

"Australian Left Review", a by-monthly, issued on the initiative of the Communist Party of Australia, in its No. 4, 1967 published an extensive article: "Middle East Background" by S.B. We republish the main parts of this important article:

"... At the end of the Second World War Palestinian Jewry started a struggle for independence and against restrictions on migration by Britain, the Mandatory Power. The outcome of this struggle was the establishment on November 29, 1947, by decision of the United Nations, of Jewish and Arab states, politically separate but economically joined, a decision fully backed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. In the last resort it was the outcome of the struggle of the Israelis, who defeated the Arab armies (armed and officered by the British) which invaded Israel in defiance of the UN decision.

This invasion led to the failure of the establishment of the Arab Palestine state, and contributed to the creation of the huge number of Arab refugees in areas adjacent to Israel. This refugee problem soon became a stumbling block to establishment of peace between Israel and her Arab neighbors."

"... However, Arab chauvinism constituted a great danger to Israel and has played into the hands both of imperialists and of reactionary circles in Israel. Both reactionary and progressive Arab states have claimed that Israel is simply a creation of imperialism and should be eliminated, and that all Jews who came to Israel after 1948 should be deported. This view was peddled at anti-imperialist and peace gatherings, even Israeli communist and progressive delegates being often barred from meetings because Arab delegates threatened a boycott.

The Palestine Organisation and Army of Liberation, whose aim is to "liberate" Palestine by means of war and terror, were active in the Arab countries, and since the beginning of 1965 the sabotage and terror groups of "Al-Fatah", organised by the pro-Chinese circles following Mao Tse-Tung's ideas, operated in the Israeli border areas.'

Following the Israeli raids of July 1966, top Syrian leaders, in their statements, supported the terrorist acts and proclaimed that "people's war for liberation of Palestine" and "guerilla warfare to liquidate Israel had started (cf. C. P. of Israel Bulletins). So although Arab chauvinism was greatly strengthened as a result of the pro-imperialist policy initiated by Ben-Gurion in 1955, it was expressed in such a racist and intolerable

way that Israelis and Jewish people all over the world had to oppose it strongly, and rightly so.

Arab chauvinism resulted, as chauvinism does, in something very harmful for the Arab people - it provided a justification for aggressive acts of the imperialists and reactionary Israeli circles.

And yet there are many people in Israel striving for peace. In 1951, 1952 and 1954, half of the Israeli adult population signed peace petitions. In 1957 the C. P. of Israel, Mapam (left socialists), Hapoel Hamizrachi and Agudath Israel (religious workers and orthodox Jews) strongly criticised the whole system of retaliation. "

"...On the Arab side, up to 1964, Arab Communists took a correct stand in the spirit of internationalism, at their conference in Prague in 1964 adopting a resolution advocating a peaceful solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict based on recognition of mutual rights of all. Unfortunately in 1966 the Arab Communist Parties reversed their stand and adopted at their conference a resolution supporting the Palestinian Liberation Front which stands for a holy war against Israel. In these circumstances the call of the Communist Parties and progressive forces in Israel and elsewhere to refrain from the use of force was unable to prevent...the recent Israeli-Arab war, which resulted in much destruction, suffering and bloodshed. "

"...Soviet policy in the Middle East has been open to criticism because unjustified statements were from time to time made by Soviet representatives at the UN and elsewhere, comparing zionism with nazism. Such statements antagonised many democrats and progressive people throughout the world, and could be interpreted by the Arabs as the green light for their anti-Israel chauvinism. The breaking off by the Soviet Union of trade relations with Israel after the invasion of Egypt in 1956 and non-resumption ever since, while trading with Britain and France, the main culprits of the invasion, could also be interpreted by the Arabs and others to mean that Israel and not the Western powers is the imperialism of the Middle East and the main enemy of the people. And it is said with some justification that more forthright statements indicating that the Soviet Union is not only for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs but also for the legitimate rights of Israel, might have helped to moderate the influence of chauvinist sentiments among the Arabs. "

\* This, together with a stronger stand against chauvinist elements by all progressive Arabs, and the continued struggle of peace-loving and realistic forces in Israel, is the only way in which a stable peace in the Middle East will eventually be realised on the only possible basis - mutual recognition of Jews and Arabs of the legitimate rights of both peoples, and joint opposition to imperialist domination and manipulation. "

